

REMARKS

Examiner has rejected Applicants' Claims 1 - 5 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over J.G. Sholes" (U.S. 2,075,408). Applicants traverse said rejection.

Sholes teaches a system for the transfer of a liquified gas. The present invention also teaches such a transfer system, but the system invented and advocated by applicants differs fundamentally from the Sholes system. A significant difference between the present invention and the Sholes patent is that Sholes utilizes a number of "supporting tubes 33" (Page 2, Col. 1, Line 71). The supporting tubes are coupled to a "plate 32" (Page 2, Col. 1, line 59). The supporting tubes form a recipient area for holding the gas cylinders to be filled by the Sholes transfer system. The tanks are placed within the supporting tubes and then the supporting tubes are contacted by the cooling brine. Simply put, the Sholes patent teaches a system where there is an air gap between the cooling brine and the tank. A "non freezing liquid placed in the tank 29, for circulation around the tubing 38 and supporting tubes 33, was cooled to plus 13° F., and that the air in the tubes 33, and the small cylinders placed in them, were cooled to plus 25° F." (Page 2, Col. 2, lines 45-50). An air gap tends to insulate the tank, and hence is inefficient in the cooling of the gas that is contained within the tank. In the present invention, the tank is

partially submerged in the cooling fluid, or the brine. The tank wall has a direct contact with the cooling fluid, and hence, avoids the inherent inefficiency of the Sholes teaching.

The use of direct contact between the brine and the tank is contrary to the teachings of the Sholes patent, and hence, should not be utilized as prior art.

Another difference between the Sholes patent and the present invention is the use, in the Sholes patent, of a tank filling line that is immersed in a cooling fluid (See number 44, Figure 3, and Page 2, column 2, line 50-51). The present invention does not employ this method, and directly connects the supply tank with the tank to be filled (See Figure 1, present application).

The Claims have been amended to underscore the differences between the prior art as taught by Sholes and the present invention. Applicants submit that the present Amendments, along with the Remarks, address and fully respond to each of the rejections. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections and pass the application forward to issue.